

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 1, 12 and 23 have been amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claim rejections in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,897,616 to Kanevsky, et al.

Claims 1 and 12 commonly recite, inter alia, *computing a confidence score based on the identity claim using speech input from the user, wherein the confidence score is a measure of confidence in the validity of the identity claim; and if the confidence score meets a threshold value, providing the user access to secured data having varying levels of security, wherein providing access comprises determining a level of secured data that may be accessed by the user based on the computed confidence score.*

Although Kanevsky discloses in Col. 3, lines 23-43 (as cited by Examiner) “generating a score”, Kanevsky does not disclose in the cited section that the score is used to determine a level of secured data that can be accessed by the user, as essentially claimed in claims 1 and 12. In fact, Kanevsky discloses in Col. 3, lines 45-50 using the score to determine whether to deny or grant access to the system (binary decision). Accordingly, withdrawal of the anticipation rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The following claim rejections were asserted under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

(i) claims 2, 7, 13 and 18 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,370,648 to Diep;

(ii) claims 3-16 and 14-17 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,105,132 to Fritch;

(iii) claims 8 and 19 stand rejected being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Diep as applied to claims 7 and 8, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,321,339 to French;

(iv) claims 9-11 and 20-22 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of French;

(v) claims 23-25 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Diep as applied to claim 18, and further in view of Fritch; and

(vi) claims 26-28 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Kanevsky in view of Diep in further view of Fritch as applied to claim 23, and further in view of French.

In view of the above amendments and arguments for claims 1 and 12, it is respectfully submitted that the obvious rejections of claims 2-11 (which depend from claim 1) and claims 13-22 (which depend from claim 12) are not supported by the combination of Kanevsky and any one of the cited references, for at least the same reasons given for respective base claims 1 and 12. Indeed, it is respectfully submitted that cited references do not disclose or suggest, singularly or in any combination, *computing a confidence score based on the identity claim using speech input from the user, wherein the confidence score is a measure of confidence in the validity of the identity claim; and if the confidence score meets a threshold value, providing the user access to*

secured data having varying levels of security, wherein providing access comprises determining a level of secured data that may be accessed by the user based on the computed confidence score, as essentially claimed in claims 1 and 12.

Indeed, although Fritch arguably discloses assigning different security levels to data, Fritch discloses a method whereby access to different levels of security are based on matching the security level of the data to the security level that is assigned to the identity of the particular “task” or person that is seeking to access to the data (see, e.g., Col. 6, lines 18-20; Col. 8, lines 18-20). Neither Fritch nor any of the cited references discloses using a measure of confidence of the validity of a person making an identification claims to control access to secured data at different security levels, as essentially recited in claims 1 and 12.

Therefore, for at least the above reasons given for claims 1 and 12, claims 2-11 and 13-22 are patentable over the cited combinations of references.

Furthermore, with respect to claim 23, the arguments set forth above are equally applicable to the rejection of claim 23 based on the combination of Kanevsky, Diep and Fritch. Indeed, such combination does not disclose or suggest a system comprising, inter alia, *a computation module that computes a confidence score that is a measure of confidence in the validity of an original identity claim provided at a commencement of a dialog session, and a dialog manager for controlling access to data in the database, wherein access to the data classes is limited to a data class in which a last computed confidence score meets or exceeds a confidence score assigned to that data class.* Fritch does not disclose or suggest classification levels assigned to information objects that are based on confidence measures for the validity of identity claims of a user.

Therefore, claims 23 is believed to be patentable and non-obvious over the combination of Kanevsky, Diep and Fritch. In addition, dependent claims 24-28 are believed to be patentable over cited references at least for the same reasons as claim 23. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 is respectfully requested.

Early and favorable consideration by the Examiner is respectfully urged. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone or personal interview may facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, it is requested that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Frank DeRosa

Reg. No. 43,584

Attorney for Applicants

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
1900 Hempstead Tnpk.
East Meadow, NY 11553
TEL.: (516) 357-0091
FAX: (516) 357-0092